

Daniel C. Girard (SBN 114826)
 dgirard@girardsharp.com
 Adam E. Polk (SBN 273000)
 apolk@girardsharp.com
 Jordan Elias (SBN 228731)
 jelias@girardsharp.com
 Sean P. Greene (SBN 328718)
 sgreene@girardsharp.com
GIRARD SHARP LLP
 601 California Street, Suite 1400
 San Francisco, CA 94108
 Telephone: (415) 981-4800
 Facsimile: (415) 981-4846

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Kim Stevenson and Howard Tarlow

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

KIM STEVENSON, et al.,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

 GREGORY W. BECKER, et al.,

 Defendants.

Case No. 23-cv-02277-HSG

**STIPULATION AND ORDER
 REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF
 ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR
 REMAND FOR APPEAL AND
 CORRESPONDING STAY OF
 PROCEEDINGS**

Date: April 16, 2024
 Time: 2:00 p.m.
 Judge: Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.

STEPHEN ROSSI, et al.,

 Plaintiffs,

 v.

 GREGORY W. BECKER, et al.,

 Defendants.

Case No. 23-cv-02335-HSG

[additional caption on following page]

STEPHEN ROSSI, et al.,

Case No. 24-cv-01674-HSG

Plaintiffs,

v.

ANTHONY DECHELLIS, et al.,

Defendants.

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-12 and the Court’s March 28, 2024 Order Denying Motions to Remand, (*Stevenson* Dkt. No. 87; *Rossi I* Dkt. No. 60) (“March 28 Order”), Plaintiffs Kim Stevenson, Howard Tarlow, and Stephen Rossi (“Plaintiffs”) and Defendants Gregory W. Becker, Daniel J. Beck, Eric A. Benhamou, John S. Clendening, Richard D. Daniels, Alison Davis, Roger F. Dunbar, Joel P. Friedman, Karen Hon, Jeffrey N. Maggioncalda, Beverly Kay Matthews, Mary J. Miller, Kate D. Mitchell, John F. Robinson, Garen K. Staglin, KPMG LLP, Benhamou Global Ventures, LLC, Fifth Era, LLC, Scale Venture Partners, Anthony DeChellis, Christopher Cooper, and Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC (collectively, “Defendants” and, together with Plaintiffs, the “Parties” and each, a “Party”), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS, on April 10, 2023, Plaintiffs Kim Stevenson and Howard Tarlow filed a putative securities class action against certain Defendants in the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, captioned *Stevenson, et al. v. Becker, et al.*, No. 23CV413949 (the “*Stevenson* Action”);

WHEREAS, on April 14, 2023, Plaintiff Stephen Rossi filed a putative securities class action in the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara alleging substantially similar claims against the same Defendants named in the *Stevenson* Action, and also naming as Defendants Benhamou Global Ventures, LLC, Fifth Era, LLC, and Scale Venture Partners, captioned *Rossi v. Becker, et al.*, No. 23CV414120 (the “*Rossi I* Action”);

WHEREAS, on February 15, 2024, Plaintiff Stephen Rossi filed a putative securities class action in the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara alleging substantially similar claims against Defendants Anthony DeChellis, Christopher Cooper, and Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC, captioned *Rossi*

1 *v. DeChellis, et al.*, No. 24CV431200 (the “*Rossi II* Action”) (together with the *Stevenson* and *Rossi I*
 2 Actions, the “State Actions”);

3 WHEREAS, certain Defendants removed the State Actions to the District Court for the Northern
 4 District of California;

5 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs filed motions to remand the *Stevenson* and *Rossi I* Actions back to state
 6 court (the “Remand Motions”), and the Parties to the *Stevenson* and *Rossi I* Actions briefed and argued
 7 those motions to remand before the Honorable Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr. (*Stevenson*, Dkt. Nos. 56, 66,
 8 70, 77; *Rossi I*, Dkt. Nos. 39, 49, 50, 57);

9 WHEREAS, on March 27, 2024, pursuant to a stipulation of all parties, Plaintiffs submitted an
 10 administrative motion to relate the *Rossi II* Action to the *Stevenson* and *Rossi I* Actions (*Stevenson* Dkt.
 11 No. 86), and, as of the date of this filing, the Court has not yet ruled on relatedness;

12 WHEREAS, on March 28, 2024, this Court issued the March 28 Order, which denied Plaintiffs’
 13 motions to remand the *Stevenson* and *Rossi I* Actions, and further held that “the interests of clarity
 14 would be best served by definitive guidance from the Ninth Circuit as to the recurring legal question of
 15 whether Section 22(a) of the 1933 Securities Act [(“1933 Act”)] bars removal of even actions ‘related
 16 to’ a bankruptcy action pursuant to Section 1452(a),” and thus directed the Parties to the *Stevenson* and
 17 *Rossi I* Actions to submit a stipulation and proposed order certifying an interlocutory appeal of the
 18 March 28 Order to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) (the
 19 “Interlocutory Appeal”);

20 WHEREAS, the Parties agree that staying the proceedings in district court in *Stevenson* and
 21 *Rossi I* pending the resolution of the forthcoming Interlocutory Appeal will best serve the interests of
 22 judicial economy, conservation of time and resources, and orderly management of *Stevenson* and *Rossi*
 23 *I*;

24 WHEREAS, Plaintiff Rossi believes remand of the *Rossi II* Action to state court is appropriate
 25 on the same bases set forth in the Remand Motions in the *Stevenson* and *Rossi I* Actions, and Defendants
 26 in the *Rossi II* Action oppose remand;

1 WHEREAS, Plaintiff Rossi and Defendants in the *Rossi II* Action agree that the March 28 Order
 2 shall be determinative of whether the *Rossi II* Action is remanded to state court unless the March 28
 3 Order is reversed, vacated, or modified by the Interlocutory Appeal, in which case the determination of
 4 the remand issue by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the Interlocutory Appeal shall be
 5 determinative of whether the *Rossi II* Action is remanded to state court;

6 WHEREAS, upon a ruling relating the *Rossi II* Action to the *Stevenson* and *Rossi I* Actions,
 7 Plaintiff Rossi and Defendants in the *Rossi II* Action anticipate submitting a stipulation, subject to Court
 8 approval, staying the proceedings in district court in the *Rossi II* Action pending determination of the
 9 Interlocutory Appeal; and

10 WHEREAS, the Parties have met and conferred as directed by the Court in the March 28 Order
 11 and submit this stipulation and proposed order accordingly.

12 NOW THEREFORE, the Parties hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

13 1. The Parties agree that the March 28 Order involves (i) a controlling question of law, (ii)
 14 as to which there are substantial grounds for difference of opinion, and (iii) that an immediate appeal
 15 may materially advance the litigation's ultimate termination. 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b); *In re Cement*
 16 *Antitrust Litig.*, 673 F.2d 1020, 1026 (9th Cir. 1982). First, whether this Court has removal jurisdiction
 17 is a controlling question of law. *United States v. Woodbury*, 263 F.2d 784, 787 (9th Cir. 1959)
 18 (describing as “fundamental” to a § 1292(b) analysis the question “whether a court to which a cause has
 19 been transferred has jurisdiction”). Second, this Court's observations that “[c]ourts are divided on
 20 whether the removal bar of Section 22(a) trumps Section 1452(a)'s bankruptcy removal provision” and
 21 that “[t]he Ninth Circuit has yet to consider the issue,”¹ evidences that there are substantial grounds for
 22 difference of opinion that the Ninth Circuit has not resolved. Finally, an immediate appeal of the March
 23 28 Order “may materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation” because the controlling
 24 issue is jurisdictional. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b); *Cement Antitrust*, 673 F.2d at 1026; *Robbins Co. v.*
 25 *Lawrence Mfg. Co.*, 482 F.2d 426 (9th Cir. 1973). If the Ninth Circuit agrees with Plaintiffs that the

26
 27 ¹ March 28 Order at 4 (citing *Cobalt Partners, LP v. Sunedison, Inc.*, No. C 16-02263-WHA, 2016 WL
 28 4488181, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 26, 2016)).

removal provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1334(b) and 1452(a) do not override the removal bar in Section 22(a) of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77v(a), its decision would terminate further litigation before the district court and all three State Actions would be remanded back to state court. *See Cobalt Partners, LP v. Sunedison, Inc.*, 2016 WL 4488181, at *8 (N.D. Cal. 2016) (certifying “for interlocutory review under Section 1292(b): whether Section 22(a) of the 1933 Securities Act bars removal of actions ‘related to’ a bankruptcy action pursuant to Section 1452(a),” holding that the issue “involves a controlling question of law as to which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion and that an immediate appeal from the order may materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation”).

2. The proceedings in district court in the *Stevenson* and *Rossi I* Actions will be stayed pending the resolution of the forthcoming Interlocutory Appeal, and no Defendant in the *Stevenson* or *Rossi I* Actions shall have any obligation to answer or otherwise respond to the complaints in the *Stevenson* or *Rossi I* Actions prior to resolution of the forthcoming Interlocutory Appeal and a schedule is thereafter set for Defendants to respond.

3. Upon a ruling relating the *Rossi II* Action to the *Stevenson* and *Rossi I* Actions, Plaintiff Rossi and Defendants in the *Rossi II* Action shall submit a stipulation, subject to Court approval, staying the proceedings in district court in the *Rossi II* Action pending determination of the Interlocutory Appeal.

4. In addition to being binding on all parties to the *Stevenson* and *Rossi I* Actions, the March 28 Order shall be binding on the parties to the *Rossi II* Action with respect to, and determinative of, Plaintiff’s expected motion to remand the *Rossi II* Action to state court, unless the March 28 Order is reversed, vacated, or modified by the Interlocutory Appeal, in which case the determination of the remand issue by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the Interlocutory Appeal shall be determinative of whether the above-captioned actions, as well as the *Rossi II* Action, are remanded to the state court.

5. This Stipulation is entered into without prejudice to any Party seeking any interim relief.

6. Nothing in this Stipulation shall be construed as a waiver of any of Defendants' rights or positions in law or equity, or as a waiver of any defenses, except as to sufficiency of service of process, that Defendants would otherwise have, including, without limitation, jurisdictional defenses.

Dated: April 11, 2024

By: /s/ Adam E. Polk
 Daniel C. Girard (SBN 114826)
 dgirard@girardsharp.com
 Adam E. Polk (SBN 273000)
 apolk@girardsharp.com
 Jordan Elias (SBN 228731)
 jelias@girardsharp.com
 Sean P. Greene (SBN 328718)
 sgreene@girardsharp.com
GIRARD SHARP LLP
 601 California Street, Suite 1400
 San Francisco, CA 94108
 Telephone: (415) 981-4800
 Facsimile: (415) 981-4846

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Kim Stevenson and Howard Tarlow

Dated: April 11, 2024

By: /s/ David W. Hall
 David W. Hall (SBN 274921)
 dhall@hedinhall.com
 Armen Zohrabian (SBN 230492)
 azohrabian@hedinhall.com
HEDIN HALL LLP
 Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 1400
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: (415) 766-3534
 Facsimile: (415) 402-0058

Attorneys for Plaintiff Stephen Rossi

Dated: April 11, 2024

By: /s/ Michael G. Bongiorno
 MICHAEL G. BONGIORNO (appearance *pro hac vice*)
 michael.bongiorno@wilmerhale.com
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
 HALE AND DORR LLP**
 7 World Trade Center
 250 Greenwich Street
 New York, NY 10007

Telephone: (212) 230-8800
Facsimile: (212) 230-8888

TIMOTHY J. PERLA (appearance *pro hac vice*)
timothy.perla@wilmerhale.com
ERIKA M. SCHUTZMAN (appearance *pro hac vice*)
erika.schutzman@wilmerhale.com
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP**
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: (617) 526-6000
Facsimile: (617) 526-5000

MICHAEL A. MUGMON (SBN 251958)
michael.mugmon@wilmerhale.com
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP**
One Front Street, Suite 3500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (628) 235-1000
Facsimile: (628) 235-1001

*Counsel for Defendants Eric A. Benhamou, Richard D.
Daniels, Alison Davis, Roger F. Dunbar, Joel P.
Friedman, Jeffrey N. Maggioncalda, Beverly Kay
Matthews, Mary J. Miller, Kate D. Mitchell, John F.
Robinson, Garen K. Staglin, Benhamou Global Ventures,
LLC, Fifth Era, LLC, and Scale Venture Partners*

Dated: April 11, 2024

By: /s/ Christopher W. Johnstone
Christopher W. Johnstone (SBN 242152)
chris.johnstone@wilmerhale.com
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP**
2600 El Camino Real, Suite 400
Palo Alto, CA 94306
Telephone: (650) 858-6147
Facsimile: (650) 858-6100

Peter G. Neiman (appearance *pro hac vice*)
peter.neiman@wilmerhale.com
Jessica N. Djilani (appearance *pro hac vice*)
jessica.djilani@wilmerhale.com
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP**

7 World Trade Center
250 Greenwich Street
New York, NY 10007
Telephone: (212) 230-8800
Facsimile: (212) 230-8888

Attorneys for Defendant Karen Hon

Dated: April 11, 2024

By: /s/ James N. Kramer
James N. Kramer (SBN 154709)
jkramer@orrick.com
Alexander K. Talarides (SBN 268068)
atalarides@orrick.com
ORRICK HERRINGTON AND SUTCLIFFE LLP
The Orrick Building
405 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 773-5900
Facsimile: (415) 773-5759

Attorneys for Defendant Gregory W. Becker

Dated: April 11, 2024

By: /s/ Jennifer S. Windom
Jennifer S. Windom (appearance *pro hac vice*)
jwindom@kramerlevin.com
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
2000 K Street NW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-4500
Facsimile: (202) 775-4510

Kristopher Kastens (SBN 254797)
kkastens@kramerlevin.com
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
333 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 700
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 752-1700
Facsimile: (650) 752-1800

Barry H. Berke (appearance *pro hac vice*)
bberke@kramerlevin.com
Darren A. Laverne (appearance *pro hac vice*)
dlaverne@kramerlevin.com
Daniel M. Ketani (appearance *pro hac vice*)
dketani@kramerlevin.com
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
Telephone: (212) 715-9100
Facsimile: (212) 715-8000

Attorneys for Defendant Daniel J. Beck

Dated: April 11, 2024

By: /s/ Richard H. Zelichov
Richard H. Zelichov (CA SBN 193858)
richard.zelichov@us.dlapiper.com
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
2000 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 400 North Tower
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 595-3180
Facsimile: (310) 595-3480

Bruce G. Vanyo (CA SBN 60134)
bruce@katten.com
Paul S. Yong (CA SBN 303164)
paul.yong@katten.com
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
2121 Avenue of the Stars
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: 310-788-4401
Facsimile: 310-788-4471

Attorneys for Defendant John S. Clendenning

Dated: April 11, 2024

By: /s/ Lisa R. Bugni
Lisa R. Bugni (SBN 323962)
KING & SPALDING LLP
50 California Street, Suite 3300
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 318-1200
Facsimile: (415) 318-1300
Email: lbugni@kslaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant KPMG LLP

Dated: April 11, 2024

By: /s/ Ellen Leonida
Ellen Leonida (SBN 184194)
leonida@braunhagey.com
BRAUN HAGEY & BORDEN LLP
351 California Street, 10th Floor
San Francisco, California 94104

Telephone: (415) 599-0210

Jason C. Rubinstein (*pro hac vice* pending)
jrubinstein@fklaw.com
**FRIEDMAN KAPLAN SEILER ADELMAN
& ROBBINS LLP**
7 Times Square
New York, New York 10036-6516
Telephone: (212) 833-1100

Attorneys for Defendant Anthony DeChellis

Dated: April 11, 2024

By: /s/ Nicole L. Chessari
Nicole L. Chessari (SBN 259970)
NChessari@goodwinlaw.com
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
601 Marshall Street
Redwood City, CA 94063
Telephone: (650) 752-3100
Facsimile: (650) 853-1038

Jonathan A. Shapiro (SBN 257199)
JShapiro@goodwinlaw.com
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
3 Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 733-6202
Facsimile: (415) 276-3064

Robert Tiefenbrun (SBN 310975)
RTiefenbrun@goodwinlaw.com
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
601 South Figueroa Street, Suite 4100
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 426-2500
Facsimile: (213) 623-1673

Attorneys for Defendant Christopher Cooper

Dated: April 11, 2024

By: /s/ Daniel H.R. Laguardia
Daniel H.R. Laguardia (SBN 314654)
daniel.laguardia@shearman.com
SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP
140 New Montgomery Street, 10th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105-2997
Telephone: 415.616.1100

Facsimile: 415.616.1199

Adam Hakki (*pro hac vice* pending)

adam.hakki@shearman.com

Daniel Lewis (*pro hac vice* pending)

daniel.lewis@shearman.com

Joshua Ebersole (*pro hac vice* pending)

joshua.ebersole@shearman.com

SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP

599 Lexington Avenue

New York, NY 10022

Telephone: (212) 848-4000


Facsimile: (212) 848-7179

Attorneys for Defendant Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC

ORDER

Pursuant to stipulation, and having concluded for the reasons stated in the stipulation that the March 28 Order involves a controlling question of law as to which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion and that an immediate appeal from the order may materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation, **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 4/11/2024


HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge